

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed July 12, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being purportedly directed to non-statutory subject matter, and indicated that claims 1-29 and 34-44 contain allowable subject matter. In the Advisory Action dated February 14, 2007, the Examiner maintained the § 101 rejection of claims 30-33. The proposed amendments to claims 30 and 33 filed after the Final Office Action were not entered.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 30 and 33. Claims 30-33 are currently pending. Of these, claims 30 and 33 are independent.

A. Rejections of Claims 30-33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner asserted that “there is no input speech disclosed in the specification.” See Advisory Action, Continuation Sheet. Applicants respectfully submit that input speech is disclosed throughout the specification, figures, and originally filed claims. See, e.g., FIG. 1.

The Examiner also asserted that claims 30-33 are directed to non-statutory processes “because they merely manipulate an abstract idea (mathematical algorithm) without a claimed limitation to a practical application.” Office Action at 2. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s interpretation of the claims. In an effort to advance prosecution, however, Applicants have considered the examples of statutory processes provided by the Examiner, and amended independent claims 30 and 33.

The Examiner indicated that “claims directed to receiving an input speech vector and generating a table for use in Gaussian distribution probability calculations during speech recognition being performed on the received input speech vector are considered

statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101.” Office Action at 2-3. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 30 and 33 are directed to subject matter that the Examiner considers statutory, and therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejection of claims 30 and 33.

Moreover, because claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 30, claims 31 and 32 are directed to statutory subject matter by virtue of their dependence on claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejection of claims 31 and 32.

B. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation might advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call Applicants’ undersigned attorney at (571) 203-2710.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 6, 2007

By: 

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743